There are some persons who are of opinion that a maintenance allotment is sufficient for the present, and that separation should become perfected after the lapse of 20 or 25 years. To my understanding there is no force in this contention. An arrangement of this nature will create an uncertainty in the enjoyment of property and would stand in the way of permanent improvements besides keeping titles in suspense. Thus partition alone will see the termination of the growing difficulties of Tharawad management. In the last two Sessions of the S. M. P. Assembly, representations were made in favour of individual partition, and this is advocated by several people. I regard it as an extreme step not warranted by our present conditions and fraught with serious consequences to the community concerned. I have therefore followed in the main the recommendations of Mr. Govinda Pillai's Committee that partition of Tharawad property should be allowed to Thaivazhies only after the death of the common mother, or with her consent when she is alive, and that only the most 'senior' of the Thaivazhies should be allowed to sue for division in the first instance. A different rule has to be followed when a common uncle or a common brother is alive. In that case, the opinion of the majority of the branches has to be considered. The division has in all cases to be made on the basis of a *per capita* calculation with certain modifications in exceptional cases.

I have dwelt on the question in a general manner as details need not be entered into at present. The general sense of the community is in favour of partition and the opinion is shared by shrewd observers from outside. I cannot do better in this connection than quote the memorable words of our former Dewan, Dewan Bahadur P. Rajagopalachariar, who says with the true insight of a statesman 'whatever my personal views in the matter may be, I may say at once on behalf of Government that they do not wish to enact a law for partition ignoring the protests of the Non-official Members of this Council who belong to the community affected by the law, but I may assure you that the time will come ere long when the unanimous voice of the Nair community will demand the provision for partition and this very Council will have to take up again this question of partition.' I trust that the time prophesied by him has arrived, and I request the Council to grant permission that I may introduce a Bill into the Council on the lines indicated above."

Seconded by Mr. Parameswaren Pillai.

The President said that the Council was at liberty to grant the required permission if they were of that opinion, but that the Government reserved to themselves the full right to deal with the Bill later on as they thought fit. The President added that the Government, by acceding to the motion, did not commit themselves to any view with regard to the proposed measure.

The motion was put to the vote and carried.

THE SUCCESSION CERTIFICATE REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Subba Aiyar moved for permission to introduce a Bill to amend the Succession Certificate Regulation, IX of 1090, by suspending the operation of Rule 33 of the Legislative Council Rules, as, according to that Rule, fifteen days had not elapsed then since the publication of the Bill in the Gazette under Rule 32.

Seconded by Mr. Rengaswami Aiyengar.

Carried.

Mr. Subba Aiyar said that, under the Succession Certificate Regulation, Section 12, court fee had to be levied on every application under it and that, unlike the Court Fees Regulation, the Succession Certificate Regulation contained no provision for the grant of exemption from payment of such fees. He said that it was thought expedient that the Government should have the power to exempt particular applications or classes of applications from the payment of fees under the Regulation, and that it was with that object that the amending Bill was introduced. He also observed that the Bill was a non-contentious measure and could not meet with opposition from any Member, for the reason that the Government thereby proposed only to *remit* the fees leviable according to the Regulation. Mr. Subba Aiyar therefore moved that the operation of the ordinary rules of business be suspended, so that the Bill might go through all the further stages except the final reading.

Seconded by Mr. Sesha Aiyar.

Carried.

The consideration of the Bill being over, Mr. Subba Aiyar moved that the same be read again on a future day of which notice should be given.

Seconded by Mr. Rengaswami Aiyengar.

Carried.

THE NANJINAD VELLALA BILL.

The Secretary read out the substance of the petitions received on the Nanjinad Vellala Bill.

Mr. Subba Aiyar moved that, as the petitions referred to, received since the submission of the Select Committee's report, had been under the consideration of Government, the discussion of the provisions of the Bill be deferred.

Seconded by Mr. Sesha Aiyar.

Carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly